



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/965,197	11/06/1997	SATOSHI EJIMA	JAO32373	3544

25944 7590 03/25/2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

081965197

Applicant(s)

Ejima et al

Examiner

Sax

Group Art Unit

2174

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/3/03
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9-11, 15-22, 24, 26-28, 32-41, 43, 45-47, 51-56, 58, 60-62, 66-67 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9-11, 15-22, 24, 26-28, 32-41, 43, 45-47, 51-56, 58, 60-62, 66-67 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2173

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. Per applicant request, claims 6, 8, 12-14, 23, 25, 29-31, 42, 44, 48-50, 57, 59, and 63-65 have been cancelled.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7, 15-17, 18-22, 24, 32-34, 35-41, 43, 51, 52-56, 58, 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al (5414811) in view of Nishikawa et al (5539426).

4. Regarding claims 1-2, see Parulski et al: Note the information processing apparatus that stores the plurality of images and designates them based on user selection. (the Abstract, Figures 2, 5-8, column 2 lines 40-68, column 3 lines 23-58, column 4 lines 7-24 and 39-54) The screen is divided into areas according to the number of images and the images are displayed. (column 5 lines 14-32, column 7 lines 1-40, columns 11-12). Parulski et al do not go into the specific details of the image reduction and, but do mention image manipulation and screen manipulation.

Art Unit: 2173

Furthermore, see Nishikawa et al.: the Abstract, Figures 2, 4, column 2 lines 1-58. See how this reduces the images for proper display arrangement. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to display the images as reduced in the apparatus of Parulski et al, because it would provide a convenient way using display abilities to arrange plural numbers of images in a divided screen display. The dividing means in Nishikawa et al, as well as the ability in Parulski et al, is such that the screen is divided into n^2 areas when the number of designated images is greater than $(n-1)^2$ and equal to or less than n^2 . (Figures 2 and 4 and column 3 lines 45-60). Thus the images are smaller than $1/n$ height by $1/n$ width. This is not specifically stated as having to be the way it is divided everytime, but rules are stated for image alignment for efficient display of images, and as mentioned this can be done. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to divide the screen this way, because it would provide an efficient way using the system's capability to display the images efficiently.

5. Regarding claims 3-5, the aspect ratio of the divided areas equals that of the designated images in Nishikawa et al. (Column 4 lines 37-53).

6. Regarding claims 7, a user specified limit may be used to prohibit more than a predetermined number of images from being selected. One of the images may be selected to occupy the whole screen. See again Nishikawa et al Figure 4.

Art Unit: 2173

7. Regarding claims 15-17, the images may be larger. (Nishikawa Figure 3) They may be line drawings. The apparatus has a display, and may be an electronic camera or other devices with scanning capabilities. (Nishikawa column 3 lines 17-34). The images selected may be divided into two sets of screen divided displays, not all of which may be displayed at once. (Parulski column 10 lines 34-55)

8. Claims 18-22, 24, 32-34, 35-41, 43, 51, 52-56, 58, 66-67 have the same features as above and are rejected for the same reasons.

9. Claims 9-11, 26-28, 45-47, 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al (5414811) in view of Nishikawa et al (5539426) and further in view of Bolnick et al (5838317).

10. Regarding claims 9-11, 26-28, 45-47, and 60-62, in addition to the aforementioned, Parulski et al do mention the possibility of a television display, which would include sound data, but neither Parulski et al nor Nishikawa et al go into specific details of sound data images and symbol representations. But Parulski et al do mention applications such as representing and accessing data. Bolnick et al however do show image symbols which represent computer resources of various types, including video and sound data implicitly. See the Abstract, Figures 1, 22A, column 2, column 3 lines 1-30, column 6 lines 28-68, column 8 lines 32-68, for example.

Art Unit: 2173

Sound or other data may not have an 'image' associated with it, and is represented by a symbol. When selected, the data is reproduced. The images are laid out according to screen dividing rules. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to include this in the image display system as envisioned from Parulski et al and Nishikawa et al, because it would provide an efficient way to utilize an image displaying system that lays out and divides images efficiently on a screen to represent and access data.

11. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The images are in fact reduced and show a symbol in some form. The detailed expression or configuration of the symbols, if in fact even exists, is still not brought out in the claims. The division into n^2 areas is done in Figures 2 and 4, and the obviousness is explained above. The reduced images are then smaller than $1/n$ height by $1/n$ width. Applicant is invited to contact examiner at 703-305-9582 to discuss interpretation and claim language.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Steve Sax at telephone number (703) 305-9582.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Sax whose telephone number is (703) 305-9582. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2173

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238	After Final Communication
(703) 746-7239	Official Communication
(703) 746-7420	For Status Inquiries, draft communication

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized, cursive 'Z' or 'S' shape followed by a horizontal line.